

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the October 10, 2007 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-5 and 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,905 issued to Ellison, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,130,951 issued to Christie, et al. The rejection asserts that Ellison allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for enabling a privileged mode during device initialization, which is allegedly taught by Christie.

The claims are directed toward **enabling operating modes of a device during device initialization** so the device operates in either only a privileged mode or in both the privileged mode and a non-privileged mode. The concept of operating in these modes is described in the specification in paragraph [0003]. There it is stated that programs operating in the privileged mode are allowed to access memory and system resources without limitation. Programs operating in the non privileged mode are restricted from accessing certain memory regions and/or device functions. The device is set during initialization so that it operates in either the privileged mode or the combination of the privileged and non-privileged mode. According to the claims, the device selects one of these modes during initialization and functions at all times in the selected mode. Thus, if the device is selects operation in only the privileged mode, the device will not operate *any* programs in the non-privileged mode. This is done on a device level, and not on a program level.

None of the prior art teaches a device that is set during initialization to operate in either one mode or the combination of modes. Ellison teaches a device operates in a dual mode at all time. As shown in Figure 1B of Ellison, as described in column 4, lines 11-45, Ellison teaches the processor allowing some applications to operate in the isolated area and others to operate in the non-isolated area. Ellison never teaches an initialization that locks the device into one of the two modes. Thus, some programs can operate in both the isolated area and the non-isolated area, while others operate only in the non-isolated area.

Christie teaches operation in either a secure mode or a normal mode, but does not teach operation in both of these modes. The claims require determination during the device initialization whether the device is to operate either in the privileged mode or in both the privileged and non-privileged modes, and then enabling the privileged mode if it is determined that the device is to operate only in the privileged mode and enabling both the privileged and the non-privileged modes if it is determined that the device is to operate in both the privileged and the non-privileged modes. Thus, the device has to be capable of setting operation in both modes or in only the privileged mode. Even if one combines Ellison and Christie, the present invention is not taught. This is because nowhere in either reference is the selection of operating in a privileged mode or in both the privileged and non-privileged modes disclosed. The Office Action states that Ellison teaches operation in both modes, and Christie teaches operation in the privileged mode. However, the ability to select one of these two methods of operation during device initialization is never taught in either reference.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 24 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 24 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 24.

Claims 2-5, 7-8 11-14, 16-19 and 25-26 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 7-8 11-14, 16-19 and 25-26 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-8 11-14, 16-19 and 25-26.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated January 14, 2008

By: /James T. Hagler/
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502